

SOME NEW BOOKS.

The Man who the People Meant to Make the Next Chief Magistrate.

Among the biographies of Gen. Hancock which have recently appeared, two deserve particular attention. The memoir prepared by Col. Foxney is of peculiar interest and value as regards those chapters which exhibit the political side of his subject's life, and especially the principles of reconstruction which he carried out within the scope of his official direction during Gen. Hancock's exercise of military command in Louisiana and Texas. On this branch of his theme, with which thoughtful men are especially concerned at the present juncture, Col. Foxney is qualified to speak, and his treatment of the whole problem of reconstruction, as well as of the phase with which Gen. Hancock was connected, will commend itself to the earnest and candid reader. The other book to which we would direct notice at this time is the memoir compiled by the late Rev. D. X. Foster, and recently revised, condensed, and corrected by Mr. F. A. Foxney and Mr. K. A. Foxney (Aplettons). These two volumes, taken together, supply all the data needed to form a just conception of the man placed in nomination for the highest office which now is, or ever has been, conferred by the suffrages of a people. Neither work has much in common with the typical campaign biography, such being marked by a creditable degree of sobriety and self-restraint, as if the writer felt instinctively that a tone of fulsome laudation would jar upon the ear, and that plain words are best to set forth the clear record of a patriot, a soldier, and a gentleman.

Winfield Scott Hancock was born in February, 1824, in a small village in Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, not many miles east of Norristown. He was of native American stock, his father, Benjamin Franklin Hancock, having been born in Philadelphia, and his grandfather, Richard Hancock, being a native of one of the twenty-five hundred American soldiers, here increased in an English prison during the war of 1812. Benjamin Franklin Hancock was a lawyer, having been admitted to the bar in Montgomery County in 1828, about which time he removed to the town of Norristown. In his early years at the bar he was appointed District Attorney, and he continued in the diligent practice of his profession until his death in 1867. His wife, the mother of Gen. Hancock, was a daughter of Edward Horwath, who had been a soldier in the Revolutionary war. It is not to be stated that the principles of the Hancock family were always, especially after the Presidency of John Adams, those of the anti-Federal or Democratic party. This fact did not prevent Benjamin Hancock from naming, by a patriotic impulse, one of his sons after Gen. Winfield Scott, who had borne so conspicuous a part in the recent war of 1812-15 as to make him one of the most admired of American soldiers.

At an early age young Hancock was sent to Norristown Academy, which, in its day, was deemed an excellent school. It is perhaps worth noting that the boy organized a military company among his schoolmates, being chosen their Captain, and that he was a member of it does not appear that all his leisure hours were devoted to imitation military exercises. He and his brother, we are told, collected quite an extensive cabinet of mineralogical and geological specimens, and were members of a scientific society, in which experiments were made in chemistry and natural philosophy. Another relation of his childhood, which is not so likely to leave an impression on the mind, when young Winfield was a boy of 11 years, a campaign newspaper was started in the town, and printers being hard to obtain, the lad went into the office, and helped on the cause by setting type, and printing, even working the press. By the time the campaign was over, he had become quite a printer, and was naturally led, by the business in which he had been engaged, to take a certain interest in the politics of his native State.

In 1840, at the age of sixteen, young Hancock entered the Military Academy at West Point. He passed the examination for admission, and was, respectively, not being extraordinarily advanced in scholarship, for he had not yet learned the importance of hard study. He has since expressed the opinion that it would have been better if he had not entered until he was eighteen, though he would not have been able to do so, because it was one of those cases in which the young man's own interest in the subject of the examination, and the names of those cadets who were other classmates or contemporaries of Hancock's at the Academy are many who have since acquired eminence in the world. Such are Gen. U. S. Grant, George B. Meade, Frank P. Blair, Jr., F. Smith, J. F. Reynolds, Rosecrans, Lyon, and others of the Union Army, and Stonewall Jackson, Longstreet, Pickett, and E. K. Smith of the Confederate service. Hancock graduated in 1844, being brevetted Second Lieutenant in the 4th Artillery. The time of his graduation Gen. Scott, who had just retired, was in the field, and he preferred being assigned, to what remained of the young man's military career, to the War Department that the young man was allowed to proceed to Mexico.

Hancock landed at Vera Cruz in season to join Gen. Pierce's column, which was about to march to reinforce Gen. Scott at Puebla. On this march there was no extended or heavy fighting, although a somewhat sharp encounter took place at the National Bridge, held and fortified by the Mexican forces. Hancock was in command of one of the companies detailed to charge and capture the bridge and its batteries, a movement which was successfully accomplished, and he was promoted to the rank of Second Lieutenant in a company of his regiment stationed on the frontier of Mexico, where the difficulties, which afterward terminated in the Mexican war, had already begun. The commander of Fort Washita, commanding Lieut. Hancock's services, and was, in consequence, and it was not until after repeated applications to his superior officers and to the War Department that the young man was allowed to proceed to Mexico.

Hancock landed at Vera Cruz in season to join Gen. Pierce's column, which was about to march to reinforce Gen. Scott at Puebla. On this march there was no extended or heavy fighting, although a somewhat sharp encounter took place at the National Bridge, held and fortified by the Mexican forces. Hancock was in command of one of the companies detailed to charge and capture the bridge and its batteries, a movement which was successfully accomplished, and he was promoted to the rank of Second Lieutenant in a company of his regiment stationed on the frontier of Mexico, where the difficulties, which afterward terminated in the Mexican war, had already begun. The commander of Fort Washita, commanding Lieut. Hancock's services, and was, in consequence, and it was not until after repeated applications to his superior officers and to the War Department that the young man was allowed to proceed to Mexico.

thus enabled to revisit his home in Pennsylvania, from which he had been absent for five years. He followed his father, who had rejoined his regiment, to which he had been appointed Adjutant, being now stationed at St. Louis, and acting as aide-de-camp to the commander of the military department lying between the Indian country of the South and the British possessions. It was during his service here that Lieut. Hancock was married to Miss Almira Russell, daughter of Mr. Samuel Russell, a merchant of St. Louis. It is proper here to state that the union thus formed has proved one of the happiest. Two children were born of the marriage, one of whom, Russell, named after his maternal grandfather, is now living at the age of thirty.

In November, 1855, Lieut. Hancock was appointed Quartermaster, with the rank of Captain, and was ordered to Florida, where the Seminoles had broken out in active hostilities. The military operations against the Seminoles were exceptionally perplexing and difficult, and of high importance, in that they involved the care of the important factor connected with the supplies. Hardly had the trouble in Florida been allayed when that series of agitations began which ultimately led to the disorders in Kansas. On the personal application of Gen. Hancock, he was ordered to that department, Capt. Hancock was ordered to Fort Leavenworth, where he remained until the end of March, 1858, when the Kansas difficulty being settled, he was directed to accompany Gen. Harney's expedition to Utah. At Fort Bridger, Utah, Capt. Hancock was ordered to command the Sixth, and by whom he was at once appointed regimental Quartermaster. The destination of this regiment was now changed by Gen. A. S. Johnston, who had discretionary power, to Denison, Ark., and on Capt. Hancock's departure the regiment was ordered to transport and subsistence for the expedition on its long journey of 1,119 miles. An inspection of the report subsequently made by him to the Quartermaster-General, and giving all the details of this journey, sufficiently demonstrates the energy, vigilance, energy, and untiring toil which marked the progress of the expedition. Day and night it was incumbent on the Quartermaster to exercise constant watchfulness over his charge, and how efficiently the duty was fulfilled may be inferred from the fact that on the arrival of the expedition at Denison, Ark., the entire outfit was delivered actually in an excellent condition, and without any important loss or accident whatever.

Capt. Hancock was stationed at Los Angeles, Cal., when the secession of the Gulf States occurred, and he made early and earnest application to be relieved from duty on the Pacific coast, and to return to the seat of war. The request being granted, he sailed for New York in September, 1861, and without waiting even to visit his parents, within a few miles of whose home he passed on route, he reported himself at Washington for active duty. His abilities, and the importance of the services which he had already rendered, had been recognized by the War Department, and with a view of profiting by his administrative and organizing qualities, that at first assigned him to the post of Chief Quartermaster on the staff of Gen. Robert Anderson, who had been placed in command of the Union forces in Kentucky. He was destined, however, to a more important position, Gen. McClellan having proposed his name for the position of Brigadier-General, the commission was issued within a fortnight after his arrival in Washington, and Gen. Hancock at once bent all his energies to aid his new commander in the creation of the Army of the Potomac. We need not dwell upon the difficulty of transforming a raw and untried force, nor upon the skill and thoroughness with which the organization was performed; we may merely note in passing, that throughout the war Gen. Hancock never commanded any but volunteer soldiers, and that they, and they only, share with him the credit of his victories.

It was during the winter of 1861-62, devoted to the Army of the Potomac, that Gen. Hancock, through the exhibition of self-reliance, firmness, and address, succeeded in establishing such relations with his officers and men as to have earned the confidence of the military authorities, and to have become a general favorite. Inspiring, at the same time, so much good will and confidence that his name thereafter stirred the enthusiasm of his troops like the tones of a trumpet. Officers and men found him exact and yielding in regard to subordination, and the promptness of his orders, and his thoroughness in the execution of his orders, and his confidence that his name thereafter stirred the enthusiasm of his troops like the tones of a trumpet. Officers and men found him exact and yielding in regard to subordination, and the promptness of his orders, and his thoroughness in the execution of his orders, and his confidence that his name thereafter stirred the enthusiasm of his troops like the tones of a trumpet.

When the Army of the Potomac landed on the peninsula which became the theatre of the first grand operations of the war, Gen. Hancock's brigade was one of the most complete and efficient of the Army. It was composed of men who were such of our troops as were engaged against the enemy's right met with repeated repulses, and at the close of the day had gained no substantial advantage. Gen. Hancock, with less than 2,000 men, fought and won an important action which resulted in the immediate evacuation of the town and its works by the enemy. Governing Gen. Hancock's conduct in this affair, Gen. McClellan, in his published report, said: "Satisfied that the result of Hancock's engagement was to give us possession of the decisive point of the battle field, during the night I countermanded an order for the evacuation of the town and its works by the army. In this light was captured the first color taken by the Army of the Potomac, and it is right to state that so high an appreciation did Gen. McClellan have of Hancock's achievement that he personally thanked each regiment under the latter's command, and directed that the names of the officers and men who distinguished themselves in this affair should be published in the 'Williamsburg' emblazoned on their colors.

The next close encounter of Hancock's brigade with the enemy was in the action of Garnett's Hill, which occurred on the same day during which the main portion of the army was so severely defeated at Gaines's mill. "Hooker's fight," says Swinton, "was really quite unnecessary, for the difficult obstacles against which he had to contend might have been easily surmounted by the right flank, which was actually done by Hancock, who, with slight loss, determined the issue." In the fact of June 28, which began the famous and terrible movement known as "The Seven Days," the enemy assailed the rear guard of Hancock's brigade, but their attack was handsomely repulsed. During the night march from Williamsburg to the James River, Hancock commanded the advance of the rear guard of the Sixth Corps, and it is but justice to his brigade to say that at the end of the seven days, during which time it was constantly exposed to assault by day and night, it presented an unblemished front, and so far from being demoralized, it was ready to move to the front of our lines and offer battle to the enemy.

The Sixth Corps, to which Gen. Hancock's brigade belonged, did not take part in Pope's operations, being occupied in the defence of Washington, and in the operations of the campaign, which terminated at Antietam. We need not say that the situation of the army and that of the whole country at this time was appalling. Gen. Pope had been utterly defeated, and the movement of Lee up the Potomac threatened either the capture of Washington, or the capture of the capital. Gen. McClellan, however, being restored to the command, the Army of the Potomac was speedily put in motion, and the process of reorganiza-

tion was carried on during the march, this proceeding being in accordance with the general example of the Sixth Corps. In the two actions which made up the battle of South Mountain Hancock's brigade actively participated, and, after the passes had been carried, the Sixth Corps, with Hancock's brigade in the advance, pressed forward, and arrived on the battle field of Antietam at about 10 o'clock on the morning of Sept. 17. At once went into action to support the right wing of the army, which, under Gen. Sumner, had been badly shattered, and was now hard pressed by the Confederates. Hancock's brigade advanced forward in quick time, and struck the enemy just as they were attacking some of our unimpaired batteries, by which movement the latter were unquestionably saved, for the onset upon them was determined, and there was not a single regiment of infantry within supporting distance of them when Hancock came upon the field. Hancock's chief force was working its way from our batteries to the General Jackson's men, the reader will infer that the work undertaken was no child's play.

The operations of the Sixth Corps at Antietam closed Gen. Hancock's official relation to the gallant brigade which he had uninterruptedly commanded from the time when he had organized the brigade in the month of August, 1861, though the transfer on the field of battle to a higher command by selection of the General-in-Chief was a high compliment, and placed the recipient in the prominent position of a General of Division, yet it was a trial to be separated from Hancock's Brigade, as his old comrades had been so long together, and as Hancock and the country, "I shall never forget," says an eye-witness, "his first meeting I beheld of Gen. Hancock and his old brigade, after he had been transferred from it at Antietam. It occurred near Falmouth, Va., in the spring of 1863, when the Sixth Corps were marching north on the Rappahannock river, and the Second Corps during one of Gen. Burnside's movements. The brigade had halted for a rest near Gen. Hancock's headquarters, and sent word that they had come to see him. Upon his appearance, officers and men broke out into cheers of delight. The troops were in the air, and every man felt that he was in the presence of the commander who had first taught them to be soldiers and first led them into battle."

In the battle of Fredericksburg, the Second Corps, to which Hancock's division belonged, was ordered by Gen. Burnside, then Commander-in-Chief, to take the position of the Heights, a formidable and, as it proved, impregnable position, defended by large masses of troops and many batteries of artillery. In the assault which followed Gen. Hancock led his division through such a fire as has rarely been encountered in warfare. The men forced their way through the fire, and in fifteen or twenty places of the fatal wall was broken down, and although they found it impossible to carry the position, would not relinquish an inch of their ground, but held it under murderous discharges of musketry and cannon until late in the night, when they were relieved by fresh troops. Of this assault Greeley writes in his history: "Brave as our soldiers were, death than those who climbed Marcy's Hill that fatal day. And again: 'Never did men fight better, or die more bravely than did most of Hancock's division.' After that stone wall so strong that it even artillery could make no impression. The loss of the Union army in the light of Fredericksburg was 12,321 men, and Hancock's division was one of the one-sixth of this entire loss fully upon Hancock's division of 5,000 men sufficiently attests what kind of work they did that day.

In the movement which culminated in the battle of Chancellorsville, Gen. Hancock bore a conspicuous part. His division was closely and hotly engaged on May 2 and May 3, 1863, but on the 4th, when the army was ordered to break through the lines. The position occupied by Gen. Hancock in this action was one of the most exposed on the whole field, being constantly swept by the enemy's artillery, and his horse was shot under him. His division was the last to leave the field on the 4th, when the army was ordered to retreat. Hancock's position in the rear-most unfortunate movement on the part of the Commander-in-Chief, for it gave the enemy the roads leading to Fredericksburg, and resulted in the loss of Sedgwick's corps. This campaign terminated Gen. Hancock's career as a Division Commander. On the 23d of May, 1863, he was promoted to the permanent command of the Second Corps, by orders of the President of the United States.

It would be superfluous to enter upon any minute description of the decisive field of Gettysburg; but it is not to be forgotten that in the movements of this campaign Gen. Hancock took merely a prominent part, but not a controlling part. For it so happened that he selected the ground for the great conflict of the 2d and 3d July, and established that arrangement for the battle which was substantially maintained until the victory was won. On the morning of the 1st Gen. Hancock received a communication from Gen. Meade, announcing that Gen. Reynolds, who had commanded the left wing of the army, had been killed, or badly wounded, and directing Gen. Hancock to turn over his own corps to the Second, to Gen. Gibbon, and proceeding forthwith to the front to assume command of the Eleventh, First, and Third Corps. Gen. Hancock called Gen. Meade's attention to the fact that Gen. Howard, and I am sure that Gen. Meade would not have hesitated to have replied in substance that he could not help that for this was an emergency in which he could not stand on etiquette, but must call on those he deemed most suited for the occasion. What followed Gen. Hancock's advent on the field is thus described by Swinton: "As the confused throng of fugitives was pouring through Gettysburg, Gen. Hancock arrived on the ground. A most pressing duty was here forced upon him, for it was clear that if the flight of the shattered masses of the First and Eleventh Corps was not stayed, a great disaster must ensue. In such an emergency, it was necessary to act with promptness and decision. It is hardly possible to describe the mysterious but potent magnetism that calmed, subdued, and inspired, there results one of those sudden moral transformations that are among the marvels of the phenomena of battle. This quality Hancock possessed in a high degree, and his calmness and decision were a source of inspiration to his troops. The lines having been established so as to deter the enemy from further advance, Gen. Hancock, on the evening of July 1, detached an aide-de-camp to Gen. Meade, carrying the latter that he considered Gettysburg the place on which to fight the impending battle. To this message Gen. Meade replied, 'I will order up the troops.' We shall not dwell upon the incidents of the day, which were of high importance, but we shall mention that Hancock, in the judgment of the largest armies handled in modern warfare, maintained a fierce and persistent struggle. No painting by word or pencil could convey an adequate conception of the stupendous features of this Titanic conflict. Every part of the extended battle field witnessed a desperate and costly drama of destruction, but the culminating movement was the advance on the third day of Pickett's line of 18,000 men in a tremendous charge on the troops under Hancock's command. With the steady sweep of an ocean wave these brave Virginians passed forward, and, under the fire of our batteries, Hancock was in Washington in command of the Middle Military Division during the trial and execution of the prisoners charged with the assassination of President Lincoln, he was not a member of the military commission which tried Mr. Surratt, neither had he anything to do with the trial, nor does any responsibility rest on him for the finding of the court, or for the sentence imposed. Thus much of statement in regard to this matter will, perhaps, seem pertinent enough in view of certain interested and unfounded assertions."

With a few words we may now consider the career of Gen. Hancock as Commander-in-Chief of the command of the Middle Military Department, and established his headquarters at Baltimore. This city, we need not say, had been thoroughly and judiciously fortified, but so importantly and judiciously did Gen. Hancock

administer the affairs of his command that much of this feeling was soon removed. A like result followed his treatment of the Department of Missouri, where, so late as August, 1862, the public peace was threatened by the combative tendencies of the friends of secession. It was at this epoch, and under the peculiar difficulties which surrounded him, that Hancock began to be noted for his unflinching adherence to the essence of constitutional law, which continued to characterize his connection with administrative authority thereafter. It was his efficient and benign influence in these fields of duty which led to his appointment in February, 1867, to the command of the Fifth Military District, comprising the States of Louisiana and Texas. Before setting out for New Orleans he was ordered to Washington, where he remained for some days in conference with the national authorities concerning the new and difficult service to which he had been appointed. He reached the headquarters of his district toward the close of November, and immediately carefully considered the subject of the reconstruction of the Southern States under the acts passed by Congress, and having fully determined upon his own duty in the premises, it will be remembered that previous to the fact that Hancock assumed command at New Orleans, Congress had parcelled out the South into a number of military districts, or sub-districts as they were called, and had appointed over each a military governor clothed with despotic powers. Under the principles of reconstruction laid down by the Federal Legislature, Gen. Hancock was appointed to be the ruler of two great States, having authority to remove civil magistrates and suppress the local tribunals, to establish military commissions, and suspend the State laws. Such action on the part of Congress seemed to be based on the assumption that the Southern people had forfeited all their civil liberties, and were not entitled to any of the civil rights of freemen. On such a foundation, and no other, were enacted the harsh statutes which were generally enforced throughout the South; but fortunately a large discretion was reserved to the military governor, of which Gen. Hancock availed himself to the most judicious and successful interpretation to these laws. It was on the steamer which conveyed him to New Orleans that he drew up the military order which has since become celebrated as "Order Number 40," and in which he proclaimed that the Constitution of the United States should be the basis of all laws, but that the fundamental laws of the land, and the palladium of the civil rights of all the people.

"In war," ran this magnanimous and admirable document, "it is indispensable to repel force by force, to overthrow and destroy opposition to lawful authority. When insurrectionary force has been overthrown and established, and the civil authorities are ready and willing to perform their duties, the military power should cease to lead and the civil administration should resume its natural and rightful dominion. Solely impressed with these views, the General announced that the great principles of American liberty are still the inheritance of this people, and ever should be. The right of trial by jury, the habeas corpus, the liberty of the press, the freedom of speech, the natural rights of persons, and the rights of property must be preserved." It was of this order that the most remarkable episode penned by a hand invested with patriotic position, that Judge Black wrote: "Years is the most distinct and emphatic recognition which the principles of American liberty have received at the hands of any high officer in a Southern command. It has the very ring of the Revolutionary metal. Washington never said a thing in better taste, and more to the point, than that peace has her victories, and that the peace of those who have been overthrown is the peace of those who have been overthrown. You have done well, and I congratulate you," he continued, "not because it will make you the most popular man in America, for I dare say you care nothing about that, but because it will give you, through all time, the solid reputation of a true patriot and a sincere lover of your country, and of its government."

The power at Washington were not satisfied with the quiet, conservative, order, and energetic manner in which Hancock was administering the government of the district under his command, or rather permitting the civil authorities to administer it. This was not all according to their programme of reconstruction, and when they learned, moreover, that his wise and conciliatory course was winning him golden opinions—not only from the people placed under his control, but from all right-judging persons the country over—they determined to do their worst. The measures taken to this end were sufficiently characterized by Gen. Garfield, the Chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives, introduced a bill to reduce the number of Major-Generals in the army, with the avowed purpose of curtailing Gen. Hancock. The bill, however, was never pressed to a passage, those friendly to it fearing that it would excite a violent demonstration in favor of the persecuted officer. A safer method was adopted, which was to effect, by petty and humiliating interference with Gen. Hancock's jurisdiction and administration in the Fifth Military District, the purpose of which his enemies felt unable to accomplish by legitimate means. A succession of harassing acts followed, shrewdly calculated to provoke a resignation. Under such pressure Gen. Hancock wrote to a friend in Congress: "I hope to be relieved here soon. The President is no longer able to protect me, so that I may expect some humiliation after another, until I am relieved. I am now preparing for any event, nothing so humiliating as to resign. I believe to be honest and right." In March, 1868, he was, at his own request, relieved of his command at New Orleans.

No review, however summary, of Gen. Hancock's law-abiding and patriotic record would be complete without a glance at the convictions developed in the new famous and important document, written at the most critical juncture of the disputed election of 1876. "The army," wrote Gen. Hancock, "should have nothing to do with the selection or inauguration of Presidents. The people elect the President. We of the army have only to obey his mandates, and are prohibited from doing anything to obstruct or aid him. Our arms are only to be used in lawful, our commands are only to be obeyed. Our duty is to obey, and to provide that no President should inaugurate another, that he should be inaugurated in a lawful manner, and that it should be a just and honorable inauguration. Elsewhere he observes in the same letter: 'I was not in favor of the removal of Mr. Hayes from office, and if I had any voice to give, I would have given it to him. I would have advised him not, under any circumstances, to allow himself or his troops to determine who were the lawful members of a State Legislature. It is no business of the army to enter upon such questions.' And finally he says: 'The army is laboring under disadvantages, and has been used unjustly in the judgment of the people (in mine country), and we have lost a great deal of the kindly feeling which the community at large has for us. It is time to set us right.'"

On April 22, just a week after President Lincoln's assassination, orders were issued at Washington, directing Gen. Hancock to proceed to that city, and two days after his arrival there he received explicit instructions from the War Office, those being the orders which led to that official connection between Hancock and the trial of the conspirators against the President. The simple facts concerning this matter are that although Gen. Hancock was in Washington in command of the Middle Military Division during the trial and execution of the prisoners charged with the assassination of President Lincoln, he was not a member of the military commission which tried Mr. Surratt, neither had he anything to do with the trial, nor does any responsibility rest on him for the finding of the court, or for the sentence imposed. Thus much of statement in regard to this matter will, perhaps, seem pertinent enough in view of certain interested and unfounded assertions."

With a few words we may now consider the career of Gen. Hancock as Commander-in-Chief of the command of the Middle Military Department, and established his headquarters at Baltimore. This city, we need not say, had been thoroughly and judiciously fortified, but so importantly and judiciously did Gen. Hancock

administer the affairs of his command that much of this feeling was soon removed. A like result followed his treatment of the Department of Missouri, where, so late as August, 1862, the public peace was threatened by the combative tendencies of the friends of secession. It was at this epoch, and under the peculiar difficulties which surrounded him, that Hancock began to be noted for his unflinching adherence to the essence of constitutional law, which continued to characterize his connection with administrative authority thereafter. It was his efficient and benign influence in these fields of duty which led to his appointment in February, 1867, to the command of the Fifth Military District, comprising the States of Louisiana and Texas. Before setting out for New Orleans he was ordered to Washington, where he remained for some days in conference with the national authorities concerning the new and difficult service to which he had been appointed. He reached the headquarters of his district toward the close of November, and immediately carefully considered the subject of the reconstruction of the Southern States under the acts passed by Congress, and having fully determined upon his own duty in the premises, it will be remembered that previous to the fact that Hancock assumed command at New Orleans, Congress had parcelled out the South into a number of military districts, or sub-districts as they were called, and had appointed over each a military governor clothed with despotic powers. Under the principles of reconstruction laid down by the Federal Legislature, Gen. Hancock was appointed to be the ruler of two great States, having authority to remove civil magistrates and suppress the local tribunals, to establish military commissions, and suspend the State laws. Such action on the part of Congress seemed to be based on the assumption that the Southern people had forfeited all their civil liberties, and were not entitled to any of the civil rights of freemen. On such a foundation, and no other, were enacted the harsh statutes which were generally enforced throughout the South; but fortunately a large discretion was reserved to the military governor, of which Gen. Hancock availed himself to the most judicious and successful interpretation to these laws. It was on the steamer which conveyed him to New Orleans that he drew up the military order which has since become celebrated as "Order Number 40," and in which he proclaimed that the Constitution of the United States should be the basis of all laws, but that the fundamental laws of the land, and the palladium of the civil rights of all the people.

crowd, friend, and foe. I trust in thee to work my foe dismay; With arrows as the shafts of the journey's end, My sword to me in whom all evils bide, My sword for you, who share the open strife, But one by one shall all the life of man And woman's life be laid in the dust, The reveler's hand grows palsied, and the mind Fills all its empty chambers with distrust. And the dull brain's slow hinges crack with rust And weary eyes sink deep in weary brow. Rather than leave me to old age my foe, Even in my joy to you, Death, strike the blow. ELIA WALKER.

From the Independent. Headed and armed, Love leaves us the best, No man's province, Save the love of peace, Honor or love All things are good, With all their good, Pains, even die. All sense fails, With all their good, This lips and pulse, Made of the same. Summer was fair If it was not; With all their good, No thing is sweet. Autumn came soon, Where, in our joy, There are no joys, For all their good, Lingers not. Heart-breaks and songs, Love, leave us the best, Love's joy and peace. F. B. BURNHAM.

From the Church. Crowded floor, Dear, best-beloved friend! Keep within hailing distance my day; I trust in thee to work my foe dismay; With arrows as the shafts of the journey's end, My sword to me in whom all evils bide, My sword for you, who share the open strife, But one by one shall all the life of man And woman's life be laid in the dust, The reveler's hand grows palsied, and the mind Fills all its empty chambers with distrust. And the dull brain's slow hinges crack with rust And weary eyes sink deep in weary brow. Rather than leave me to old age my foe, Even in my joy to you, Death, strike the blow. ELIA WALKER.

From the Church. Crowded floor, Dear, best-beloved friend! Keep within hailing distance my day; I trust in thee to work my foe dismay; With arrows as the shafts of the journey's end, My sword to me in whom all evils bide, My sword for you, who share the open strife, But one by one shall all the life of man And woman's life be laid in the dust, The reveler's hand grows palsied, and the mind Fills all its empty chambers with distrust. And the dull brain's slow hinges crack with rust And weary eyes sink deep in weary brow. Rather than leave me to old age my foe, Even in my joy to you, Death, strike the blow. ELIA WALKER.

From the Church. Crowded floor, Dear, best-beloved friend! Keep within hailing distance my day; I trust in thee to work my foe dismay; With arrows as the shafts of the journey's end, My sword to me in whom all evils bide, My sword for you, who share the open strife, But one by one shall all the life of man And woman's life be laid in the dust, The reveler's hand grows palsied, and the mind Fills all its empty chambers with distrust. And the dull brain's slow hinges crack with rust And weary eyes sink deep in weary brow. Rather than leave me to old age my foe, Even in my joy to you, Death, strike the blow. ELIA WALKER.

From the Church. Crowded floor, Dear, best-beloved friend! Keep within hailing distance my day; I trust in thee to work my foe dismay; With arrows as the shafts of the journey's end, My sword to me in whom all evils bide, My sword for you, who share the open strife, But one by one shall all the life of man And woman's life be laid in the dust, The reveler's hand grows palsied, and the mind Fills all its empty chambers with distrust. And the dull brain's slow hinges crack with rust And weary eyes sink deep in weary brow. Rather than leave me to old age my foe, Even in my joy to you, Death, strike the blow. ELIA WALKER.

From the Church. Crowded floor, Dear, best-beloved friend! Keep within hailing distance my day; I trust in thee to work my foe dismay; With arrows as the shafts of the journey's end, My sword to me in whom all evils bide, My sword for you, who share the open strife, But one by one shall all the life of man And woman's life be laid in the dust, The reveler's hand grows palsied, and the mind Fills all its empty chambers with distrust. And the dull brain's slow hinges crack with rust And weary eyes sink deep in weary brow. Rather than leave me to old age my foe, Even in my joy to you, Death, strike the blow. ELIA WALKER.

From the Church. Crowded floor, Dear, best-beloved friend! Keep within hailing distance my day; I trust in thee to work my foe dismay; With arrows as the shafts of the journey's end, My sword to me in whom all evils bide, My sword for you, who share the open strife, But one by one shall all the life of man And woman's life be laid in the dust, The reveler's hand grows palsied, and the mind Fills all its empty chambers with distrust. And the dull brain's slow hinges crack with rust And weary eyes sink deep in weary brow. Rather than leave me to old age my foe, Even in my joy to you, Death, strike the blow. ELIA WALKER.

From the Church. Crowded floor, Dear, best-beloved friend! Keep within hailing distance my day; I trust in thee to work my foe dismay; With arrows as the shafts of the journey's end, My sword to me in whom all evils bide, My sword for you, who share the open strife, But one by one shall all the life of man And woman's life be laid in the dust, The reveler's hand grows palsied, and the mind Fills all its empty chambers with distrust. And the dull brain's slow hinges crack with rust And weary eyes sink deep in weary brow. Rather than leave me to old age my foe, Even in my joy to you, Death, strike the blow. ELIA WALKER.

From the Church. Crowded floor, Dear, best-beloved friend! Keep within hailing distance my day; I trust in thee to work my foe dismay; With arrows as the shafts of the journey's end, My sword to me in whom all evils bide, My sword for you, who share the open strife, But one by one shall all the life of man And woman's life be laid in the dust, The reveler's hand grows palsied, and the mind Fills all its empty chambers with distrust. And the dull brain's slow hinges crack with rust And weary eyes sink deep in weary brow. Rather than leave me to old age my foe, Even in my joy to you, Death, strike the blow. ELIA WALKER.

From the Church. Crowded floor, Dear, best-beloved friend! Keep within hailing distance my day; I trust in thee to work my foe dismay; With arrows as the shafts of the journey's end, My sword to me in whom all evils bide, My sword for you, who share the open strife, But one by one shall all the life of man And woman's life be laid in the dust, The reveler's hand grows palsied, and the mind Fills all its empty chambers with distrust. And the dull brain's slow hinges crack with rust And weary eyes sink deep in weary brow. Rather than leave me to old age my foe, Even in my joy to you, Death, strike the blow. ELIA WALKER.

From the Church. Crowded floor, Dear, best-beloved friend! Keep within hailing distance my day; I trust in thee to work my foe dismay; With arrows as the shafts of the journey's end, My sword to me in whom all evils bide, My sword for you, who share the open strife, But one by one shall all the life of man And woman's life be laid in the dust, The reveler's hand grows palsied, and the mind Fills all its empty chambers with distrust. And the dull brain's slow hinges crack with rust And weary eyes sink deep in weary brow. Rather than leave me to old age my foe, Even in my joy to you, Death, strike the blow. ELIA WALKER.

From the Church. Crowded floor, Dear, best-beloved friend! Keep within hailing distance my day; I trust in thee to work my foe dismay; With arrows as the shafts of the journey's end, My sword to me in whom all evils bide, My sword for you, who share the open strife, But one by one shall all the life of man And woman's life be laid in the dust, The reveler's hand grows palsied, and the mind Fills all its empty chambers with distrust. And the dull brain's slow hinges crack with rust And weary eyes sink deep in weary brow. Rather than leave me to old age my foe, Even in my joy to you, Death, strike the blow. ELIA WALKER.

Who was it that fought and on the first battle of Saratoga, one of the most splendid and decisive triumphs of the colonial period during the Revolutionary war? This question has been debated for a century, but it now seems to be conclusively settled by the new evidence collected and published in the current number of the "United States Review." Understanding the adverse opinions of the learned and some other writers, it will be remembered and acknowledged by candid reviewers of all the testimony in the case that Benedict Arnold, and no other, was the hero of Stillwater.

Public interest has been lately reawakened in this subject by the interesting, deplorable memoir of Benedict Arnold, which the biographer undertook to tell the whole truth and nothing but the truth, and to do so in a manner that would be to the credit of his early services, while refraining from any attempt to palliate the heinous offenses which made him in his later years an object of execration. In the course of the work the author, Mr. N. A. Arnold, has had occasion to examine the accounts of the engagement which took place near Stillwater on Sept. 19, 1777, and became convinced that Benedict Arnold's description of that action was strangely erroneous. The historian, speaking of the number of the British troops, stated that Mr. I. N. Arnold had made out his case, but that was the opinion of Mr. John Austin Stevens, who in the "Magazine of American History" reiterated Benedict Arnold's assertion. Mr. Stevens failed to support his view by any substantial proof; but his article had the effect of provoking the present reprint from Mr. Arnold in the "United States Review," in which the current error is traced to a discreditable origin, and in which, as we have said, new evidence of a most convincing character is, for the first time, brought to light.

It appears that the only place which Mr. Arnold had written of, was the "United States Review," in which the current error is traced to a discreditable origin, and in which, as we have said, new evidence of a most convincing character is, for the first time, brought to light. It appears that the only place which Mr. Arnold had written of, was the "United States Review," in which the current error is traced to a discreditable origin, and in which, as we have said, new evidence of a most convincing character is, for the first time, brought to light. It appears that the only place which Mr. Arnold had written of, was the "United States Review," in which the current error is traced to a discreditable origin, and in which, as we have said, new evidence of a most convincing character is, for the first time, brought to light.

The first new witness now brought forward is Gen. William Hull, who, on the 10th of September, 1777, was Major of a Massachusetts regiment, and who, in the "United States Review," is shown as having been in the ranks of the Continental Army, and who, in the "United States Review," is shown as having been in the ranks of the Continental Army, and who, in the "United States Review," is shown as having been in the ranks of the Continental Army.

The first new witness now brought forward is Gen. William Hull, who, on the 10th of September, 1777, was Major of a Massachusetts regiment, and who, in the "United States Review," is shown as having been in the ranks of the Continental Army, and who, in the "United States Review," is shown as having been in the ranks of the Continental Army, and who, in the "United States Review," is shown as having been in the ranks of the Continental Army.

The first new witness now brought forward is Gen. William Hull, who, on the 10th of September, 1777, was Major of a Massachusetts regiment, and who, in the "United States Review," is shown as having been in the ranks of the Continental Army, and who, in the "United States Review," is shown as having been in the ranks of the Continental Army, and who, in the "United States Review," is shown as having been in the ranks of the Continental Army.

The first new witness now brought forward is Gen. William Hull, who, on the 10th of September, 1777, was Major of a Massachusetts regiment, and who, in the "United States Review," is shown as having been in the ranks of the Continental Army, and who, in the "United States Review," is shown as having been in the ranks of the Continental Army, and who, in the "United States Review," is shown as having been in the ranks of the Continental Army.

Who was it that fought and on the first battle of Saratoga, one of the most splendid and decisive triumphs of the colonial period during the Revolutionary war? This question has been debated for a century, but it now seems to be conclusively settled by the new evidence collected and published in the current number of the "United States Review." Understanding the adverse opinions of the learned and some other writers, it will be remembered and acknowledged by candid reviewers of all the testimony in the case that Benedict Arnold, and no other, was the hero of Stillwater.

Public interest has been lately reawakened in this subject by the interesting, deplorable memoir of Benedict Arnold, which the biographer undertook to tell the whole truth and nothing but the truth, and to do so in a manner that would be to the credit of his early services, while refraining from any attempt to palliate the heinous offenses which made him in his later years an object of execration. In the course of the work the author, Mr. N. A. Arnold, has had occasion to examine the accounts of the engagement which took place near Stillwater on Sept. 19, 1777, and became convinced that Benedict Arnold's description of that action was strangely erroneous. The historian, speaking of the number of the British troops, stated that Mr. I. N. Arnold had made out his case, but that was the opinion of Mr. John Austin Stevens, who in the "Magazine of American History" reiterated Benedict Arnold's assertion. Mr. Stevens failed to support his view by any substantial proof; but his article had the effect of provoking the present reprint from Mr. Arnold in the "United States Review," in which the current error is traced to a discreditable origin, and in which, as we have said, new evidence of a most convincing character is, for the first time, brought to light.

It appears that the only place which Mr. Arnold had written of, was the "United States Review," in which the current error is traced to a discreditable origin, and in which, as we have said, new evidence of a most convincing character is, for the first time, brought to light. It appears that the only place which Mr. Arnold had written of, was the "United States Review," in which the current